

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-6617**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KALEIBA SHONNTA BOULER,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Frank D. Whitney,  
District Judge. (3:07-cr-00010-FDW-3)

---

Submitted: June 14, 2012

Decided: June 20, 2012

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kaleiba Shonnta Boulter, Appellant Pro Se. Keith Michael Cave,  
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina;  
Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville,  
North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kaleiba Shonnta Bouler appeals the district court's order denying her motion to reconsider the denial of her motion seeking a reduction of sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582 (2006). As we have recognized, however, a district court has no authority to grant a motion to reconsider its previous order denying a 3582(c) motion. United States v. Goodwyn, 596 F.3d 233, 235-36 (4th Cir. 2010). And in any event, it is evident from the record that Bouler is ineligible for the sentence reduction that she seeks.\* Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. United States v. Bouler, No. 3:07-cr-00010-FDW-3 (W.D.N.C. Mar. 6, 2012) We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

---

\* We note as well that Bouler's notice of appeal was untimely filed. See Fed. R. App. P. 4(b)(1)(A)(i). Nevertheless, because Rule 4(b)'s time limits are not jurisdictional, because the Government has not invoked the time bar, and because we do not find that the delay was inordinate, we decline to dismiss Bouler's appeal on the grounds of untimeliness. See Rice v. Rivera, 617 F.3d 802, 810 (4th Cir. 2010) (stating that non-statutory claim-processing rules are not jurisdictional); United States v. Urutyan, 564 F.3d 679, 685 (4th Cir. 2009); United States v. Mitchell, 518 F.3d 740, 744, 750 (10th Cir. 2008).